arXiv:1611.02646v1 [cs.AI] 8 Nov 2016

On interestingness measures of formal concepts*

S. O. Kuznetsov T. Makhalova
National Research University Higher School of Economics
Kochnovsky pr. 3, Moscow 125319, Russia

Abstract

Formal concepts and closed itemsets proved to be of big importance for knowledge discovery, both as a tool for concise representation of association rules and a tool for clustering and constructing domain taxonomies and ontologies. Exponential explosion makes it difficult to consider the whole concept lattice arising from data, one needs to select most useful and interesting concepts. In this paper interestingness measures of concepts are considered and compared with respect to various aspects, such as efficiency of computation and applicability to noisy data and performing ranking correlation.

Keywords: Formal Concept Analysis, intrestingess measures, closed itemsets.

1 Introduction and Motivation

Formal concepts play an important role in knowledge discovery, since they can be used for concise representation of association rules [1], clustering and constructing domain taxonomies [2, 3]. Most of the difficulties in the application of closed itemsets to practical datasets are caused by the exponential number of formal concepts. It complicates both the process of the model construction and the analysis of the results as well. Recently, several approaches to tackle these issues were introduced. All of the closed itemsets computed on a dataset and ordered by inclusion relation make a lattice, below we use the terminology of concept lattices and Formal Concept Analysis [4]. In terms of FCA, a concept is a pair consisting of an extent (a closed set of transactions) and an intent (the respective closed itemset).

We propose to divide existed approaches to simplifying concept mining into the groups represented on Figure 1. Methods of the first group provide a complete lattice built on modified data. The most general way to get smaller lattices is to reduce the size of datasets preserving the most important information. For this purpose such methods as Singular Value Decomposition [5], Non-negative Matrix Decomposition [6] and more computationally effective k-Means [7], fuzzy k-Means [8], agglomerative clustering of objects based on a similarity function of weighted attributes [9] are used. Another way to reduce the lattice size was proposed in [10]. This approach aims at the reduction in the number of incomparable concepts by making slight changes of the context.

The second class of methods to simplify the analysis of a lattice is computing a fragment of the original lattice. It can be done by defining an antimonotonic function w.r.t. the algorithm that computes concepts. Computing concepts with extents exceeding a threshold was proposed in [11] and studied in relation to frequent itemset mining in [12]. Authors propose an algorithm for building iceberg lattices. In this case some interesting rare concepts may be omitted, thus, it yields fewer results. From this perspective, the most promising approach is applying Δ-stability. $\Sigma o\varphi\iota\alpha$ algorithm (Sofia) for computing a lattice fragment was proposed in [13]. Δ-stability will be considered in Section 3.

*This is an updated and extended version of the conference paper "Concept interestingness measures: a comparative study", CLA - 2015


Approaches to concept mining simplification
Preprocessing: modification of the original data
Computing a subset of concepts
Postprocessing: application of indices to concepts
Dimension reduction
Changing of data entries
Application of an antimonotonic function
Modification of a closure operator

Figure 1: Classification of methods to concept mining simplification

The most well-reasoned way to build a lattice fragment is to modify the closure operator and to restrict the creation of new concepts by involving background knowledge. In [14] attribute-dependency formulas (AD-formulas) were introduced. Authors define mandatory attributes for particular attributes of a context. If an attribute is included in a closed itemset without its mandatory attributes the concepts will not be created. In [15] an analogous approach based on attribute weights was proposed. The interestingness of concepts is estimated using an aggregation function (average, maximum or minimum), which is applied to a generator, a minimal generator or to an intent. Authors also note correspondence between the numerical approach and AD-formulas.

Some restricted closure operators naturally arise from analyzed data and subject area. Carpineto and Romano [2] considered the document-term relation, where documents corresponded to objects and terms from each document were set as their attributes. Authors proposed to modify the closure operator using a hierarchy of terms as follows: two different attributes are regarded as equivalent if they have a common ancestor, which is a more general term.

In the last decade some polynomial-time algorithms for computing Galois sub-hierarchies were proposed, see [16, 17].

The main idea of methods from the last group is to assess interestingness of concepts by applying indices to them. This approach does not have disadvantages of the previously described methods, namely, getting concepts approximately corresponding to original objects or attributes, missing interesting concepts due to early stopping of an algorithm, a costly preprocessing procedure requiring the involvement of domain experts or another reliable source of background knowledge. This class, however, has its own drawbacks, for example, the exponential complexity of the lattice computation is compounded by the complexity of the index computation. The most promising approach from this point of view is to compute a subset of concepts using antimonotonic indices.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly introduces the main notions of Formal Concept Analysis. In Section 3 we consider existed indices for concepts. Section 4 focuses on a comparative study of the described in the previous section indices in the context of the most important tasks: noise reduction and selection of interesting concepts. In Section 5 we provide a guideline for the development of new indices based on arbitrary itemset indices. In Section 6 we conclude and give the direction of future work.

2 Formal Concept Analysis: Basic Definitions

Here we briefly recall the main notions of FCA [4]. Given a finite set of objects G and a finite set of attributes M, we consider an incidence relation I as the Cartesian product $G \times M$, i.e., $(g, m) \in I$ if an object $g \in G$ has an attribute $m \in M$. A formal context is a

triple (G, M, I). The derivation operator $(\cdot)'$ is defined for $A \subseteq G$ and $B \subseteq M$ as follows:

$$A' = \{m \in M \mid \forall g \in A : gIm\}$$
$$B' = \{g \in G \mid \forall m \in B : gIm\}$$

A' is the set of attributes common to all objects of A and B' is the set of objects sharing all attributes from B. The double application of $(\cdot)'$ is a closure operator, i.e., $(\cdot)''$ is extensive, idempotent and monotone. Sets $A \subseteq G$, $B \subseteq M$, such that $A = A''$ and $B = B''$ are said to be closed.

A (formal) concept is a pair (A, B), where $A \subseteq G$, $B \subseteq M$ and $A' = B$, $B' = A$. A is called the (formal) extent and B is called the (formal) intent of the concept (A, B).

A concept lattice (or Galois lattice) is a partially ordered set of concepts, the order $\leqslant$ is defined as follows: $(A, B) \leq (C, D)$ iff $A \subseteq C\,(D \subseteq B)$, a pair (A, B) is a subconcept of (C, D) and (C, D) is a superconcept of (A, B). Each finite lattice has the highest element with $A = G$, called the top element, and the lowest element with $B = M$, called the bottom element.

3 Closed itemset indices

The application of the indices offers advantages over other approaches to reducing of the number of analyzed concepts. For example, it provides an exhaustive study of a complete lattice, which is computed only once, ensures easily interpretable results by preserving objects and attributes corresponding exactly to the original data. The exponential time complexity of lattice computing accompanied by the growing size of analyzing data attaches particular importance to antimonotonic indices, since they allow creating only a subset of formal concepts.

In this section we study existed indices proposed for closed itemsets using the apparatus of FCA theory. We describe the most important index attributes and use them to build a concept lattice. Below, key characteristics of indices are described.

3.1 Description of Index Characteristics

Some of the indices originally designed to assess concepts (*"designed for closed itemsets"*) can not be applied to arbitrary itemsets (*"not applicable to arbitrary itemsets"*), whereas others were originally designed as arbitrary itemset metrics. In our study we consider only two arbitrary itemset indices, viz. support/frequency, due to their importance in concept mining.

There exist indices which deal with each attribute of an intent (or a whole context) separately and assess the contribution of these components to a concept (*"using all of the single attributes of a context"*). Another essential feature of the concept indices is the use of other concepts (*"based on comparison to other attribute sets (intents)"*). The concepts are selected based on a particular condition or index values, i.e., frequent, (dis)similar to some other concepts, etc. In this case an index is comprised of relative values or differences between absolute values of the selected concepts and the assessed concept. We additionally add only one predicate "is neighbor" (*"based on comparison to neighboring attribute sets"*), since the direct neighbors of a concept are highly important both for computing closed itemsets and for concept mining.

As it was noted previously, support has a special place in concept mining. We define *"support-based (for sets of attributes)"* and *"support-based (for single attributes)"* features to characterize whether an index is based on support. Support may be regarded as probability of an attribute or a set of attributes, along with it we also consider conditional probability (*"using conditional (joint) probability"*). *"Size-based"* indices use the size of an intent or an extent, the total number of attributes or objects, thus, they do not require to assess to particular elements of a context.

Table 1: Indices for formal concepts and their key features

	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6	a_7	a_8	a_9	a_{10}	a_{11}	a_{12}	a_{13}	a_{14}	a_{15}	a_{16}	a_{17}	a_{18}	a_{19}
stability	×	×									×							×	
Δ_l	×	×			×	×			×		×			×		×			×
Δ_h (collapse index)	×	×			×	×			×		×			×		×			×
stab2NOE	×	×			×	×			×		×			×		×			
stab2OE	×	×			×	×			×		×			×		×			
stab2EstOIE	×	×			×	×			×		×			×		×			×
probability	×	×		×				×						×		×			×
robustness	×	×			×						×	×						×	×
separation	×			×					×					×		×			
bl similarity	×	×			×	×								×				×	
bl predictability	×	×		×	×	×				×				×				×	
CV	×									×	×			×		×			×
CFC	×			×						×	×			×		×			×
CU	×			×				×		×				×		×			×
support			×				×				×			×	×				×
frequency			×				×				×	×	×	×	×				×
margin-closed	×	×			×		×		×			×	×					×	×
margin-closed*	×	×			×	×	×		×		×			×		×			
monocle	×	×																×	
δ-TCFIs	×	×			×	×	×		×		×	×	×	×		×			×

a_1: (designed) for closed itemsets, a_2: not applicable to arbitrary itemsets, ;a_3: applicable to arbitrary itemsets, a_4: using all of the single attributes of a context, a_5: based on comparison to other attribute sets, a_6: based on comparison to neighboring attribute sets, a_7: support-based (for sets of attributes), a_8: support-based (for single attributes), a_9: size-based, a_{10}: using conditional (joint) probability, a_{11}: monotonic-antimonotonic w.r.t. order on attribute sets, a_{12}: using a tuning parameter, a_{13}: boolean value, a_{14}: polynomial complexity, a_{15}: sublinear complexity, a_{16}: linear complexity, a_{17}: quadratic complexity, a_{18}: cubic and higher complexity, a_{19}: computable in one-pass over data

As it was mentioned before, the antimonotonicity is one of the most important index properties, since it allows us to rectify the problem of the exponential complexity of algorithms for deriving concepts. The time complexity is referred through the following attributes: *"polynomial complexity"*, *"sublinear complexity"*, *"linear complexity"*, *"quadratic complexity"*, *"cubic and higher complexity"*. These groups are defined w.r.t. the size of a context, i.e., $|G||M|$ under the assumption that the lattice has been computed. The possibility to compute indices in *"one-pass over data"* is relevant to complexity problem, but mostly it refers to the memory complexity and analysis of streaming data.

Some indices have a tuning parameter (*"using a tuning parameter"*) that either changes the concept rankings or is used as a binarization threshold (*"boolean value"*).

3.2 Description of Indices

In our study we use the indices described below.

3.2.1 Stability

Stability indices for formal concepts were introduced in [18, 19] and modified in [20]. For a formal concept (A, B) the (integral) intentional stability index is the probability that B will remain closed when removing a subset of objects from extent A with equal probability.

The intentional stability is defined as follows:

$$Stab_i\left(A,B\right) = \frac{|\left\{C \subseteq A | C' = B\right\}|}{2^{|A|}}$$

Intentional stability measures overfitting, i.e., the dependence of an intent (i.e., a closed pattern) on observations (objects of the respective extent). Extensional stability is defined dually.

In [21] it was noted that stability indices are antimonotonic w.r.t. chain of projections. This class of antimonotonicity contains previously known classes [22] and allows one to generate k most stable concepts with delay polynomial in k and the input size.

3.2.2 Robustness

Robustness [22] of an (arbitrary) itemset arising from a dataset has been introduced to estimate the probability that a pattern would still be generated if some transactions (rows) of the dataset are removed. For formal concept (A, B) this is the probability that B will remain closed when removing an object (row) from extent A with probability $1 - \alpha$. Hence, stability index can be considered as an instantiation of robustness for $\alpha = 0.5$. So, for formal concept $c = (A, B)$ the robustness is given as follows:

$$r\left(c,\alpha\right) = \sum_{d \leq c} \left(-1\right)^{|B_d|-|B_c|} \left(1-\alpha\right)^{|A_c|-|A_d|}$$

Proposition 1 *Stability of concept (A, B) is equal to its robustness for $\alpha = 0.5$.*

Proof

In [23] it was noted that stability can be computed recursively by the traversal of covering relation (i.e., graph of the diagram) of the concept lattice from the bottom concept to upward as follows:

$$Stab(A,B) = \frac{|\left\{C \subseteq A \mid C' = B\right\}|}{2^{|A|}} = \frac{\sigma(A,B)}{2^{|A|}},$$

where $\sigma(A, B) = 2^{|A|} - \sum_{(C,D)<(A,B)} \sigma(C, D)$.

In [24] the following relation of stability to Möbius function μ [25] was shown:

$$|\left\{C \subseteq A \mid C' = B\right\}| = \sum_{(C,D) \leq (A,B)} 2^{|C|} \mu((C,D),(A,B))$$

Using the Möbius function of the concept lattice, the formula takes the following form: $\sigma(A,B) = \sum_{(C,D)\leq(A,B)} 2^{|C|}\mu\left((C,D),(A,B)\right)$ and stability can alternatively be represented as

$$Stab(A,B) = \sum_{(C,D)\leq(A,B)} 2^{|C|-|A|}\mu\left((C,D),(A,B)\right).$$

Robustness of concept (A,B) is computed as $\sum_{k=0}^{|A|} a_k(1-\alpha)^k$, where

$$a_k = \{\sum_{(C,D)\leq(A,B)} e(D,B) \mid |A|-|C| = k\},$$

and

$$e(D,B) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } D = B \\ -\sum_{(C,D)<(E,F)\leq(A,B)} e(F,B) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This formula gives Möbius function, thus robustness can be rewritten as

$$r((A,B),\alpha) = \sum_{(C,D)\leq(A,B)} \mu\left((C,D),(A,B)\right)(1-\alpha)^{|A|-|C|}.$$

Replacing $1-\alpha$ by 0.5 we obtain the formula of stability. This completes the proof. □

3.2.3 Stability Indices

The notion of stability was revised and considered with regard to estimating concept-based hypotheses in [19]. In the paper, stability index is studied in the level-wise manner. For formal concept $c = (A,B)$ stability index of the jth level $(2 \leq j \leq n-1)$ is defined as follows: $J_j(c) = \frac{\gamma_j(c)}{\binom{n}{j}}$, where $n = |A|$, $\gamma_j(c) = |\{Y \subset A \mid |Y| = j, Y' = B\}|$.

Integral stability index is defined as $J_\Sigma(c) = \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} J_i$.

In this study we also consider integral stability indices of the jth level $(2 \leq j \leq n-1)$:

- Minor-set-based integral stability: $J_{\Sigma_j}(c) = \sum_{i=2}^{j} J_i$
- Major-set-based integral stability:$J_{\Sigma_j}(c) = \sum_{i=j}^{n-1} J_i$.

Integral stability of the jth level may be regarded as the approximation of the stability index. The survey of the problem of best approximation is given in Section 4.

3.2.4 Estimates of stability

Logarithmic Stability The problem of computing stability is $\#P$-complete [19], that hampers its application in practice where one usually faces with large-size contexts. In [24] it was proposed to use Monte Carlo approximation of stability, in [26] combination of Monte Carlo and an upper-bound estimate is described. Authors use the logarithmic scale of stability (the concept rankings remains the same):

$$LStab\,(c) = -log_2\,(1 - Stab\,(c))$$

It allows one to deal with the problem described in [27] that is closeness of stability values to 1 for large contexts.

The bounds of stability are given by

$$\Delta_{min}\,(c) - log_2\,(|M|) \leq -log_2 \sum_{d\in DD(c)} 2^{-\Delta(c,d)} \leq LStab\,(c) \leq \Delta_{min}\,(c)\,,$$

where $\Delta_{min}\,(c) = min_{d\in DD(c)}\Delta\,(c,d)$, $DD\,(c)$ is the set of all direct descendants of c in a lattice and $\Delta\,(c,d)$ is the size of the set-difference between extents of formal concepts c and d.

In [28] more precise upper bounds of the logarithmic stability were described. These estimates are based on two direct neighbors. The formulas are given below.

Max-disjoint-extents upper bound (stab2NOE) The estimate uses two lower neighbors, one of them has the maximal extent among all descenders, the second one has the maximal extent among the rested neighbors and does not share elements with the first one:

$$LStab\left(c\right) \leq \Delta_{min}\left(c\right) + \Delta_{min}^{(\emptyset)}\left(c, \Delta_{min}\left(c\right)\right)$$

where $\Delta_{min}\left(c\right) = min_{d \in DD(c)} \Delta\left(c,d\right)$, $\Delta_{min}^{(\emptyset)}\left(c, \Delta_{min}\left(c\right)\right) = d_1 + d_2$, where

$$d_1 = min_{d \in DD(c)} \Delta\left(c,d\right),$$

$$d_2 = min_{d \in DD} \left\{\Delta\left(c,d\right) | d_1 \cap d = \emptyset\right\}.$$

Max-distinguished-extents upper bound (stab2OE) To compute this index the first neighbor is selected in the same way, while the second one meets the following condition: its extent has the maximal number of objects not included in the extent of the first one.

$$LStab\left(c\right) \leq |d_1| + |d_2| - |d_1 \cap d_2|$$

where $d_2 = min_{d \in DD(c)} \left\{\Delta\left(c,d\right) | d_2 - d_1 = max_{d^* \in DD(c)} d^* - d_1\right\}$ and $d_1 = min_{d \in DD(c)} \Delta\left(c,d\right)$.

Max-extent upper bound (2EstOIE) The estimate takes into account two different maximal extends:

$$LStab\left(c\right) \leq |d_1| + |d_2| - |d_1 \cap d_2|$$

where $d_1 = min_{d \in DD(c)}\left(c,d\right)$, $d_2 = min_{d \in DD}\left(c\right)$ and $d_1 \neq d_2$. But such a "greedy" strategy can give an underestimated upper bound.

3.2.5 Concept Probability

In [29] it was noticed that some interesting concepts with the small number of objects (i.e., small extents) usually have low stability values. The concept probability was proposed to get rid of this bias. The definition of concept probability from [29] is equivalent to the concept probability introduced earlier by R. Emilion [30].

The probability that an arbitrary object has all attributes from set B is defined as follows:

$$p_B = \prod_{m \in B} p_m$$

Concept probability is defined as the probability of B being closed:

$$p\left(B = B''\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} p\left(|B'| = k, B = B''\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left[p_B^k \left(1 - p_B\right)^{n-k} \prod_{m \notin B} \left(1 - p_m^k\right)\right]$$

where $n = |G|$.

Concept probability aggregates three probabilistic components: the occurrence of each attribute from B in all k objects, the absence of at least one attribute from B in other objects and the absence of other attributes shared by all k objects.

3.2.6 Separation

The index was introduced in [29] to estimate the specificity of the object-attribute relation of a concept with respect to the formal context. It is defined as a part of the area covered by a formal concept among all nonzero elements in the rows and columns corresponding to the formal concept.

$$\mathfrak{s}\left(A,B\right) = \frac{|A||B|}{\sum_{g \in A} |g'| + \sum_{m \in B} |m'| - |A||B|}$$

3.2.7 Monocle

The Monocle [31] is a method that defines concept weights based on a subset of concepts. The weight function has the following form:

$$w(c,H) = \left(|A| + \sum_{g \in A} N_G(g,H)\right) \cdot \left(|B| + \sum_{m \in B} N_M(g,H)\right),$$

where $N_G(g,H) = |\{(A,B) \mid (A,B) \in H, g \notin A\}|$ is the number of concepts in H not containing an object g, $N_M(m,H)$ is defined similarly for attributes, $H \subset \mathcal{L}$. The weight function is monotone w.r.t. the size of H.

3.2.8 δ-Tolerance Closed Frequent Itemsets (δ-TCFIs)

δ-TCFIs [32] uses a subset of children in a lattice to assess a concept. The main idea is to delete those of concepts that are close in frequency to their direct descendants. Concept $c = (A,B)$ is δ-TCFI iif it meets the following condition: $\forall d = (C,D)$, such that $|D| = |B| + 1$, $supp(D) \geq (1-\delta) \cdot supp(B)$, where $\delta \in [0,1]$ is a tolerance factor.

3.2.9 Margin-closed itemset

The index was proposed by Moerchen et al [33]. A margin closed itemset has no supersets with almost the same support, by definition, it satisfies the following expression: $X \in FI \,\&\, \forall X' \in FI : X \subset X' \Rightarrow \frac{supp(X')}{supp(X)} \leq 1 - \alpha$, where FI is a set of frequent itemsets.

As can be seen from the formulas, margin-closed itemset and δ-TCFIs indices are very close to each other. They are based on the same indices computed on different subsets of concepts.

In our study we consider the relaxed formulation of the margin-closed itemset index, namely, we consider the ratio of the maximal extent size among all direct predecessors of a concept to the extent size of the concept itself.

Belohlavek and Trnecka in [34, 35] investigated the group of so-called "basic level" measures. It is a psychology-motivated approach that was designed to formalize the existed psychological approach to defining the basic level of concepts [36]. The group is comprised of similarity- and predictability-based indices, cue validity, category feature collocation and category utility indices.

3.2.10 Similarity approach (S)

The similarity approach to the assessment of the belonging to a basic level was proposed in [37] and subsequently formalized and applied to FCA in [34]. This index is the combination of three fuzzy functions that correspond to formalized properties outlined by E.Rosch [37]: high cohesion of concepts, considerably greater cohesion with respect to upper neighbors and a slightly less cohesion with respect to lower neighbors. The membership degree of the basic level is defined as follows:

$$BL_S = coh^{**}(A,B) \otimes coh^{**}_{un}(A,B) \otimes coh^{**}_{ln}(A,B),$$

where coh is a fuzzy function that corresponds to the conditions defined above, $\otimes$ is t-norm [38].

A cohesion function is based on the pairwise similarity of objects from an extent. To assess similarity between two objects authors use simple matching coefficient or Jaccard similarity:

$$sim_{SMC}(B_1,B_2) = \frac{|B_1 \cap B_2| + |M - (B_1 \cup B_2)|}{|M|};$$

$$sim_J(B_1,B_2) = \frac{|B_1 \cap B_2|}{|B_1 \cup B_2|}.$$

A cohesion function is one of the following aggregation functions:

$$coh^{a}_{...}(A,B) = \frac{\sum_{\{x_1,x_2\}\subseteq A, x_1\neq x_2} sim_{...}(x'_1,x'_2)}{|A|(|A|-1)/2}$$

$$coh^{m}_{...}(A,B) = \min_{x_1,x_2\in A} sim_{...}(x'_1,x'_2)$$

The Rosch's properties for upper and lower neighbors take the following forms:

$$coh^{a*}_{...,un}(A,B) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{c\in UN(A,B)} coh^{*}_{...}(c)/coh^{*}_{...}(A,B)}{|UN(A,B)|}$$

$$coh^{a*}_{...,ln}(A,B) = \frac{\sum_{c\in LN(A,B)} coh^{*}_{...}(A,B)/coh^{*}_{...}(c)}{|LN(A,B)|}$$

$$coh^{m*}_{...,un}(A,B) = 1 - \max_{c\in UN(A,B)} coh^{*}_{...}(c)/coh^{*}_{...}(A,B)$$

$$coh^{m*}_{...,ln}(A,B) = \min_{c\in LN(A,B)} coh^{*}_{...}(A,B)/coh^{*}_{...}(c)$$

where $UN(A,B)$ and $LN(A,B)$ are upper and lower neighbors of formal concept (A,B) respectively.

As the authors noted, experiments revealed that the type of a cohesion function does not affect the result, while the choice of a similarity measure can greatly affect the outcome. More than that, in some cases upper (lower) neighbors may have higher (lower) cohesion than the formal concept itself (for example, the boundary cases, when a neighbors's extent / intent is comprises of identical rows / columns). To tackle this issue of non-monotonic neighbors w.r.t. a similarity function authors proposed to take $coh^{**}_{...,ln}$ and $coh^{**}_{...,un}$ as 0, if the rate of non-monotonic neighbors is larger than a threshold.

Below, we use the following notation: SMC** and J**, where stars are replaced by the type of cohesion and similarity functions respectively.

3.2.11 Predictability approach (P)

Predictability [35] of a formal concept is computed in a quite similar way to the previous one. In this approach a cohesion function is replaced by the predictability function:

$$P(A,B) = pred^{**}(A,B) \otimes pred^{**}_{un}(A,B) \otimes pred^{**}_{ln}(A,B).$$

From this point of view, concepts are closed to basic level, if there are only few attributes outside B are contained in objects from A:

$$E(\mathbb{I}[\langle x,y\rangle \in I]\,|\mathbb{I}[x\in A]) = -\frac{|A\cap y'|}{|A|} log \frac{|A\cap y'|}{|A|}$$

$$pred(A,B) = 1 - \sum_{y\in M-B} \frac{E(\mathbb{I}[\langle x,y\rangle \in I]\,|\mathbb{I}[x\in A])}{|M-B|}.$$

3.2.12 Cue Validity (CV), Category Feature Collocation (CFC), Category Utility (CU)

The following measures are based on the conditional probability of object $g \in A$ given $y \subseteq g'$ [35]:

$$CV(A,B) = \sum_{y\in B} P(A|y') = \sum_{y\in B} \frac{|A|}{|y'|}$$

$$CFC(A,B) = \sum_{y\in M} p(A|y')\,p(y'|A) = \sum_{y\in M} \frac{|A\cap y'|}{|y'|}\frac{|A\cap y'|}{|A|}$$

$$CU\left(A,B\right)=p\left(A\right)\sum_{y\in M}\left[p\left(y'|A\right)^2-p\left(y'\right)^2\right]=\frac{|A|}{|G|}\sum_{y\in M}\left[\left(\frac{|A\cap y'|}{|y'|}\right)^2-\left(\frac{|y'|}{|G|}\right)^2\right]$$

CV deals with the probability of an extent given attributes from an intent, CFC takes into account the relation between all attributes from a context and an intent of a formal concept, and CU characterizes how much an attribute from an intent is specific for a given concept rather than for a formal context [39].

3.2.13 Frequency(support)

It is one of the most popular measures in the theory of pattern mining. Frequency arises from the assumption that the most "interesting" concepts are frequent ones:

$$supp\left(A,B\right)=\frac{|A|}{|G|}$$

The support provides an efficient level-wise algorithm of semilattice computing since it exhibits antimonotonicity (a priori property [40, 41]):

$$B_1\subset B_2\rightarrow supp\left(B_1\right)\geq supp\left(B_2\right)$$

3.3 Concept Lattice of Indices for Closed Itemsets

We consider described above indices and their characteristics in the form of the formal context represented in Table 1, the corresponding lattice consists of 73 formal concepts.

We applied described indices to the lattice and consider top-8 concepts (about 10% of all concepts) by values of the following indices: probability, separation, monocle, margin-closed, frequency, stability, stability estimates, CV, CFC, CU, predictability, similarity approach (Jaccard and SMC, aa), robustness with $\alpha=0.3$. We have got concepts with a singleton as an extent or an intent for margin-closed and probability respectively. The most interesting groups of indices (concepts) with their frequencies are listed below.

Frequency = 0.4:

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h, 2EstOIE, δ-TCFIs.

Intent: for closed, not applicable to arbitrary, based on comparison to other attr.sets, based on comparison to neighboring attribute sets, size-based, (anti)monotonic, polynomial complexity, linear complexity, computable in one-pass over data.

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs

Intent: for closed, not applicable to arbitrary, based on comparison to other attribute sets, based on comparison to neighboring attribute sets, size-based, (anti)monotonic, polynomial complexity, linear complexity.

The most interesting concepts by stability and its estimates.

Frequency = 0.33:

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, bl similarity, bl predictability, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs.

Intent: for closed, not applicable to arbitrary, based on comparison to other attribute sets , based on comparison to neighboring attribute sets, polynomial complexity.

The most interesting concepts by CV and separation.

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, separation, margin-closed, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs.

Intent: for closed, size-based.

The most interesting concepts by frequency.

Frequency = 0.25:

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, robustness, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs.
Intent: for closed, not applicable to arbitrary, based on comparison to other attribute sets, based on comparison to neighboring attribute sets, (anti)monotonic.

Extent: stability, Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, probability, robustness, separation, bl similarity, bl predictability, CV, CFC, CU, margin-closed, margin-closed*, monocle, δ-TCFIs.
Intent: for closed.

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, robustness, bl similarity, bl predictability, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs.
Intent: for closed, not applicable to arbitrary, based on comparison to other attribute sets, based on comparison to neighboring attribute set.
The most interesting concepts by monocle.

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, robustness, CV, CFC, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs.
Intent: for closed, (anti)monotonic.
The most interesting concepts by CFC.

Extent: Δ_l, Δ_h , stab2NOE, stab2OE, 2EstOIE, probability, margin-closed*, δ-TCFIs.
Intent: for closed, not applicable to arbitrary, polynomial complexity, linear complexity.
The most interesting concepts by CU.

Extent: support, frequency, δ-TCFIs.
Intent: support-based (for attribute sets), (anti)monotonic, polynomial complexity, computable in one-pass over data.
The most interesting concepts by Robust., $\alpha = 0.3$.

Extent: CV, CFC.
Intent: for closed, using conditional probability, (anti)monotonic, polynomial complexity, linear complexity, computable in one-pass over data.
The most interesting concepts by predictability, similarity (Basic Level Metrics.
As can be seen from the results of the concept rankings, most of the selected indices (accordingly the rankings) include either Δ-indices or support-based metrics. Both types of concepts have almost the same intent that causes the large number of quite similar concepts.

4 Quality of indices

Application of indices in practice is aimed mostly at addressing the following challenges: selection the most interesting concepts and original concepts from the set of concepts computed on a noisy context and bringing the lattice building process to a halt in order to avoid computing of excessive concepts.

4.1 Rank Correlation

To identify how similar the indices are, we examined the similarity of the concept rankings by index values. The pairwise similarity of indices is measured by the Kendall tau correlation coefficient [42], this coefficient takes into account not only an absolute rank, but also a relative position.

We randomly generated 4 groups of formal concepts with the following densities (the rate of the "1" in the context): 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4. Each group consisted of 100 formal contexts with the number of attributes ranged between 10 and 50, and the number of objects varied from 40 to 80.



Figure 2: The averaged Kendall tau coefficient for indices. Statistically the equal mean is in bold type

Variance of within-group pairwise correlation is quite small (not more then 0.05) and does not depend on the context density (p-values of Levene's test is less than 0.05). Since the studied values cannot be assumed to be normally distributed (based on D'Agostino and Pearson's test), the Wilcoxon's test was used to compare mean values of the Kendall tau coefficient.

The averaged values of the pairwise Kendall tau coefficients are represented on Figure 2. Among investigated indices several groups of correlated metrics are stood out, but only few values of pairwise correlation are statistically stable (have the same average value w.r.t. context densities).

One of the groups of correlated indices corresponds to approximate robustness with different values of parameters. It allows us to conclude that relative importance of concepts is mostly preserving regardless of α. Another class of indices that utilizes similarity and predictability approaches (Basic Level Metrics group) yields the second group. It should be noted, the highly correlated indices of this group are the metrics based on similarity approach with the same cohesion function and with different aggregation functions for sub/superordinate concepts. The conclusion agrees with the results presented in [34].

Other groups of correlated indices include frequency, stability and its estimates, robustness (the exact index) and some metrics of the Basic Level approach (Cue Validity – CV, Category Feature Collocation – CFC, Category Utility – CU). Stability (robustness) is the most complex index for calculation, hence it is important to identify more easily computable indices and use them instead. In our experiments we found the following correlated indices: logarithmic estimates of stability (stabl_l, stabl_h) and Max-distinguished-extents upper bound (stab2OE).

4.2 Integral Stability Indices: Best Approximation of Stability

Integral stability index as a component of stability can be used to get estimates of stability. Here, we consider the problem of stability approximation with respect to different levels of integral stability index. Since the extent size of concepts varies in the range from 0 to $|G|$, for each concept we took the level of stability depending on the size of set A, to be precise, the level is defined by formula $[rate * |A|]$, where $0 < rate < 1$.

To find the best $rate$ we used randomly generated formal contexts (described in the



Figure 3: The dependance of stability values on integral stability values

previous subsection) of different densities: 0.1, 0.2, 0.3 and used the simple linear regression. The integral stability index of the jth level was taken as a regressor and the stability index as a dependent variable.

Scatter plots of the studied indices are given in Figure 3. As can be seen from the diagrams, taking too small rates does not allow us to estimate stability, since for most concepts small subsets $Y \subset A$, such that $Y' = B$ do not exist.

The first local maximum of the coefficients of determination for model

$$stability = A * stability_{\Sigma_{ratio}} + B$$

corresponds to $rate = 0.4$ (0.78 and 0.79 for context densities 0.2 and 0.3 respectively). Thus, this value can be used as the most suitable value for computing estimates of stability by integral stability index.

4.3 Noise Filtering

In practice one usually faces with noisy data. Even a small noise rate can result in exponential explosion of the number of formal concepts [29]. In this connection, we study the ability of indices to select original concepts from the set of concepts computed on a noisy context. We took 5 formal concepts, the lattices of the first four of them have quite simple structure (see Figure 4) and the last one is a fragment of Mushroom dataset [1] consisted of 500 objects and 14 attributes.

[1] https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Mushroom



Figure 4: The concept lattices of formal contexts with 300 objects and 6 attributes (a - c), with 400 objects and 4 attributes (d)

We added different amount of noise into the contexts as follows: each entry changes with given probability (noise rate). For "noisy" lattices we identified original concepts and considered a binary classification problem. We computed the AUC (Area Under the Receiver Operator Curve) from each index separately. The averaged AUCs within groups corresponding the same datasets with different noise rates and within groups with the same noise rate for the described above contexts are given in Figure 5.

As can be seen from Figure 5, the index quality mostly depends on lattice structure rather then noise rate. Cue Validity (CV), Category Feature Collocation (CFC), Category Utility (CU) and separation have the highest AUC on particular datasets, but the quality considerably changes depending on the lattice structure. For instance, AUC of CFC varies from 0.67 to 0.95. The most stable results correspond to robustness with $\alpha \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.8\}$, the estimates of stability are able to distinguish most of the original concepts (the AUC is greater then 0.7).



Figure 5: The averaged AUC within groups with the same noise rate (dotted lines) and corresponding to the same datasets

Almost all indices are stable with respect to different noise rates. The poor data quality has the strong impact on the estimates of stability: the quality of these indices drops down as the noise rate increases. Since these metrics are based on the elements of a lattice, the more noise is introduced, the more noisy concepts are involved in calculations. The quality of similarity-based indices (Basic Level group) is close to random guessing that makes them inapplicable to the analysis of noisy data.

The experiments allow us to conclude that the CV, CU, CFC, separations, robustness, margin closeness and probability are the most suitable for the analysis of noisy data.

5 Generic approach to the assessment of closed itemsets

The problem of the arbitrary itemset assessment was thoroughly investigated in the scientific literature. Furthermore, some indices were proposed to assess associative rules - a part of

Table 2: Indices for arbitrary itemsets (associative rules $A \to B$)

Index	**Formula**
Conditional probability	$P(A\|B)$
Accuracy	$P(AB) - P(\neg A \neg B)$
Lift	$P(AB)/P(A)P(B)$
Leverage	$P(B\|A) - P(A)P(B)$
Added Value/Change of Support	$P(B\|A) - P(B)$
Relative Risk	$P(B\|A)/P(B\|\neg A)$
Jaccard	$P(AB)/(P(A) + P(B)P(AB))$
Certainty Factor	$(P(B\|A)P(B))/(1P(B))$
Odds Ratio	$\frac{P(AB)P(\neg A \neg B)}{P(A\neg B)P(\neg BA)}$
Yule's Q	$\frac{P(AB)P(\neg A\neg B)P(A\neg B)P(\neg AB)}{P(AB)P(\neg A\neg B)+P(A\neg B)P(\neg AB)}$
Yule's Y	$\frac{\sqrt{P(AB)P(\neg A\neg B)}\sqrt{P(A\neg B)P(\neg AB)}}{\sqrt{P(AB)P(\neg A\neg B)}+\sqrt{P(A\neg B)P(\neg AB)}}$
Klosgen	$\frac{\sqrt{P(AB)}(P(B\|A)P(B))}{\sqrt{P(AB)}max(P(B\|A)P(B),\ P(A\|B)P(A))}$
Conviction	$P(A)P(\neg B)/P(A\neg B)$
Collective Strength	$\frac{P(AB)+P(\neg B\|\neg A)}{P(A)P(B)+P(\neg A)P(\neg B)} \cdot \frac{1P(A)P(B)P(\neg A)P(\neg B)}{1-P(AB)-P(\neg B\|\neg A)}$
Laplace Correction	$\frac{N(AB)+1}{N(A)+2}$
Gini Index	$P(A)\{P(B\|A)^2 + P(\neg B\|A)^2\}+$ $+P(\neg A)\{P(B\|\neg A)^2 + P(\neg B\|\neg A)^2\}P(B)^2P(\neg B)^2$
Goodmanand and Kruskal	$\frac{\sum_i \max_j P(A_iB_j)+\sum_j \max_i P(A_iB_j)\max_i P(A_i)\max_j P(B_j)}{2\max_i P(A_i)\max_i P(B_j)}$
Normalized Mutual Information	$\sum_i\sum_j P(A_iB_j)\cdot\log_2\frac{P(A_iB_j)}{P(A_i)P(B_j)} / (-\sum_i P(A_i)\log_2 P(A_i))$
J-Measure	$P(AB)\log\frac{P(B\|A)}{P(B)} + P(A\neg B)\log\frac{P(\neg B\|A)}{P(\neg B)}$
One-Way Support	$P(B\|A)\log_2\frac{P(AB)}{P(A)P(B)}$
Two-WaySupport	$P(AB)\log_2\frac{P(AB)}{P(A)P(B)}$
Linear Correlation Coefficient	$\frac{P(AB)-P(A)P(B)}{\sqrt{P(A)P(B)P(\neg A)P(\neg B)}}$
Piatetsky-Shapiro	$P(AB) - P(A)P(B)$
Cosine	$\frac{P(AB)}{\sqrt{P(A)P(B)}}$
Loevinger	$1 - \frac{P(A)P(\neg B)}{P(A\neg B)}$
Information Gain	$\log\frac{P(AB)}{P(A)P(B)}$
Sebag-Schoenaue	$\frac{P(AB)}{P(A\neg B)}$
Least Contradiction	$\frac{P(AB)-P(A\neg B)}{P(B)}$
Odd Multiplier	$\frac{P(AB)P(\neg B)}{P(B)P(A\neg B)}$
Example and counter example Rate	$1 - \frac{P(A\neg B)}{P(AB)}$
Zhang	$\frac{P(AB)-P(A)P(B)}{\max(P(AB)P(\neg B),P(B)P(A\neg B))}$
Pearson's [2]	$\|G\|\left(\frac{(P(AB)-P(A)P(B))^2}{P(A)P(B)} + \frac{(P(\neg AB)-P(\neg A)P(B))^2}{P(\neg A)P(B)}\right)+$ $+\|G\|\left(\frac{(P(A\neg B)-P(A)P(\neg B))^2}{P(A)P(B)} + \frac{(P(\neg A)-P(\neg A)P())^2}{P(\neg A)P(\neg B)}\right)$

FCA. A list of formulas is given in Table 2 to make the paper self-contained. More detailed information about the listed indices can be found in [43, 44, 45]. Also note that indices for association rules can be easily adapted to concept assessment by selecting another concepts and applying the index to pairs "a selected concept, an assessed concept".

In this section we propose guidance on applying arbitrary itemset indices to closed item-

Table 3: Aggregation functions

Real-valued		**Fuzzy**	
Sum	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in V} v$	Drastic product	$min(v_1, v_2)$, if $max(v_1, v_2) = 1$ 0, otherwise
Arithmetic mean	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in V} v$	Drastic sum	$max(v_1, v_2)$, if $min(v_1, v_2) = 0$ 1, otherwise
Geometric mean	$\sqrt[\lvert V\rvert]{\prod_{v\in V} v}$	Einstein product	$\frac{v_1 v_2}{2-(v_1+v_2-v_1 v_2)}$
Harmonic mean	$\frac{n}{\prod_{v\in V} v^{-1}}$	Einstein sum	$\frac{v_1+v_2}{1+v_1 v_2}$
Median	m, such that $P(X \geq m) \geq 0.5$ and $P(X \leq m) \geq 0.5$	Hamacher sum	$\frac{v_1 v_2}{v_1+v_2-v_1 v_2}$
Generalized mean	$\sqrt[p]{\frac{1}{\lvert V\rvert}\sum_{v\in V} v^p}, p \in \mathbb{N}$	Hamacher product	$\frac{v_1+v_2-2v_1 v_2}{1-v_1 v_2}$
Maximum	$max_{v\in V} v$	Maximum	$max(v_1, v_2)$
Minimum	$min_{v\in V} v$	Minimum	$min(v_1, v_2)$
Midrange	$\frac{max_{v\in V} v + min_{v\in V} v}{2}$	Algebraic product	$v_1 v_2$
		Probabilistic sum	$v_1 + v_2 - v_1 v_2$
		Bounded difference	$max(0, v_1 + v_2 - 1)$
		Bounded sum	$min(1, v_1 + v_2)$

sets. The starting point is the personal perspective on concept interestingness. We define the following ones:

1. Some "internal"/"external" properties of the concept itself. In this case homogeneous components are considered.

2. Impact of the element gathering. Here, a metric is applied to a set and its elements: $f(set)$ and $\{f(element)|element \in set\}$.

3. Impact of a condition: $f(parameter|condition)$ and $f(parameter)$.

4. Concept pureness. This approach is based on the comparison of characteristic computed on a concept and out of the concept: $f(parameter)$ and $f(U \setminus parameter)$), where U is the domain of the parameter.

5. Stability to random changes in data. Resampling strategy is applied to a set: $\{resampling_\alpha(set)\}$, where α is a noise rate.

The application of one of the strategies listed above results in the set of homogeneous elements or the set of homogeneous elements with one distinguished element. In the first case an aggregation function is applied to peer elements. In the second case a comparison function can be applied to obtain peer elements: $aggregate_{el\in S}(compare(el, d))$ or $compare(aggregate_{el\in S}(el), d)$, where S is a set of peer elements, S is a distinguished element.

It is worth noting that both real-valued and fuzzy functions can be used to aggregate metric values. If the values are in the interval $[0, 1]$ (i.e., they could be considered as probabilistic components), a fuzzy aggregation function should be applied. The binary operators (t-norm or its dualization s-norm related the equation $t(v_1, v_2) = 1 - s(1 - v_1, 1 - v_2)$) are represented in Table 3. In the case of the poor data quality a robust aggregation

function, as median, can be applied to data. A comparison function can take one of the following forms: $* - *$, $*/*$, $log(*/*)$.

6 Conclusion

In this paper we considered various approaches to mining interesting formal concepts (closed itemsets and respective transactions). We investigated existing indices for the concept selection and proposed a general scheme for the adaptation of an arbitrary index to concept assessment.

The results of our experiments allow us to distinguish groups of correlated indices and identify those of them that can be used for the analysis of noisy data. It was shown that the noise filtering quality of indices depends mostly on the structure of the concept lattice than on the noise rate. The strongest dependence of the filtering quality on noise rate corresponds to the estimates of stability. Even a small proportion of noise added to data can significantly change the lattice structure, which results in biased values of neighbor-based indices.

We also proposed a general method for selecting and designing interestingness indices based on index features needed in a particular application. The existing concept indices fit well into this scheme.

List of indices

Used notation	*Description*
stab2NOE (Max-disjoint-extents upper bound)	Δ-measure that is based on two maximal disjoint extents.
stab2OE (Max-distinguished-extents upper bound)	Δ-measure that is based on the maximal extent and the extent with maximal disjoint subset.
stab2NOEIE (Max-extent upper bound)	Δ-measure that is based on two maximal extents.
stability	It estimates the probability of the closeness of an attribute set after removing some elements from the object set.
stab_l (Δ_l)	Δ-measure that is based on direct descendents of a concept.
stab_h (Δ_h)	Δ-measure that is based on the maximal extent.
robustness	It estimates the probability that an attribute set will be arose from the data, if some transactions are removed.
probability	It estimates the probability that a set of attributes is closed, if all attributes are independent and the probability of an attribute is assumed to be equal to its frequency.
separation	The ratio of the area covered by a formal concept to all nonzero elements in rows and columns corresponding to the concept.
frequency	The frequency of an attribute set (if all attributes are assumed to be independent).
margin closed	An index that characterize whether a frequent intent have well-distinguishable support w.r.t. other frequent intents, supersets of the intent.
CV	The sum of the conditional probabilities of objects from an extent given attributes from an intent.
CFC	Characterizes specificity of all attributes of a context for given set of objects.
CU	Characterizes specificity each context attribute for a given concept.
bl similarity (blS^*_*)	A fuzzy combination of three cohesion functions which correspond to the following conditions: high cohesion of concepts, considerably greater cohesion with respect to upper neighbors and a slightly less cohesion with respect to lower neighbors.

bl predictability (blP)	Defined the same way as the previous one, the only difference is the cohesion function is replaced by a predictability function.

References

[1] N. Pasquier, Y. Bastide, R. Taouil, L. Lakhal, Discovering frequent closed itemsets for association rules, in: Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Database Theory, Springer, 1999, pp. 398–416.

[2] C. Carpineto, G. Romano, A lattice conceptual clustering system and its application to browsing retrieval, Machine Learning 24 (1996) 95–122.

[3] G. Stumme, R. Wille, U. Wille, Conceptual knowledge discovery in databases using formal concept analysis methods, in: European Symposium on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, Springer, 1998, pp. 450–458.

[4] B. Ganter, R. Wille, Contextual attribute logic, in: W. M. Tepfenhart, W. Cyre (Eds.), Conceptual Structures: Standards and Practices, Vol. 1640 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 377–388.

[5] K. Cheung, D. Vogel, Complexity reduction in lattice-based information retrieval, Information Retrieval 8 (2) (2005) 285–299.

[6] V. Snásel, M. Polovincak, H. M. D. Abdulla, Z. Horak, On concept lattices and implication bases from reduced contexts., in: ICCS Supplement.

[7] I. Dhillon, D. Modha, Concept decompositions for large sparse text data using clustering, Machine Learning 42 (1-2) (2001) 143–175.

[8] J. Dobša, B. Dalbelo-Bašić, Comparison of information retrieval techniques: latent semantic indexing and concept indexing, Journal of Inf. and Organizational Sciences 28 (1-2) (2004) 1–17.

[9] S. M. Dias, N. Vieira, Reducing the size of concept lattices: The JBOS approach, in: Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Concept Lattices and Their Applications, Sevilla, Spain, October 19-21, 2010, 2010, pp. 80–91.

[10] I. Düntsch, G. Gediga, Simplifying contextual structures, in: M. Kryszkiewicz, S. Bandyopadhyay, H. Rybinski, S. K. Pal (Eds.), Pattern Recognition and Machine Intelligence, Vol. 9124 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 23–32.

[11] S. O. Kuznetsov, Interpretation on graphs and complexity characteristics of a search for specific patterns, Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Informatsiya Ser. 2 (1989) 37–45.

[12] G. Stumme, R. Taouil, Y. Bastide, N. Pasquier, L. Lakhal, Computing iceberg concept lattices with titanic, Data Knowl. Eng. 42 (2) (2002) 189–222.

[13] A. Buzmakov, S. Kuznetsov, A. Napoli, Sofia: How to make fca polynomial?, in: Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on What Can FCA Do for Artificial Intelligence? - Volume 1430, FCA4AI'15, CEUR-WS.org, Aachen, Germany, Germany, 2015, pp. 27–34.

[14] R. Belohlavek, V. Vychodil, Formal concept analysis with background knowledge: attribute priorities, Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C: Applications and Reviews, IEEE Transactions on 39 (4) (2009) 399–409.

[15] R. Belohlavek, J. Macko, Selecting important concepts using weights, in: P. Valtchev, R. Jschke (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 6628 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 65–80.

[16] A. Berry, M. Huchard, R. McConnell, A. Sigayret, J. Spinrad, Efficiently computing a linear extension of the sub-hierarchy of a concept lattice, in: B. Ganter, R. Godin (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 3403 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 208–222.

[17] G. Arévalo, A. Berry, M. Huchard, G. Perrot, A. Sigayret, Performances of Galois sub-hierarchy-building algorithms, in: International Conference on Formal Concept Analysis, Springer, 2007, pp. 166–180.

[18] S. O. Kuznetsov, Stability as an estimate of degree of substantiation of hypotheses derived on the basis of operational similarity, Nauchn. Tekh. Inf., Ser. 2 (12) (1990) 21–29.

[19] S. O. Kuznetsov, On stability of a formal concept, Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence 49 (1-4) (2007) 101–115.

[20] S. O. Kuznetsov, S. Obiedkov, C. Roth, Reducing the representation complexity of lattice-based taxonomies, in: Conceptual Structures: Knowledge Architectures for Smart Applications, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 241–254.

[21] A. Buzmakov, S. O. Kuznetsov, A. Napoli, Fast generation of best interval patterns for nonmonotonic constraints, in: Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases, Springer, 2015, pp. 157–172.

[22] N. Tatti, F. Moerchen, T. Calders, Finding robust itemsets under subsampling, ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS) 39 (3) (2014) 20.

[23] C. Roth, S. Obiedkov, D. Kourie, Towards concise representation for taxonomies of epistemic communities, in: Concept Lattices and Their Applications, Springer, 2008, pp. 240–255.

[24] M. Babin, S. Kuznetsov, Approximating concept stability, in: F. Domenach, D. Ignatov, J. Poelmans (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 7278 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 7–15.

[25] C. F. Gauss, Disquisitiones Arithemeticae, Arthur A. Clarke (English translator) (corrected 2nd ed.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[26] A. Buzmakov, S. Kuznetsov, A. Napoli, Scalable estimates of concept stability, in: C. Glodeanu, M. Kaytoue, C. Sacarea (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 8478 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer International Publishing, 2014, pp. 157–172.

[27] N. Jay, F. Kohler, A. Napoli, Analysis of social communities with iceberg and stability-based concept lattices, in: R. Medina, S. Obiedkov (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 4933 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 258–272.

[28] S. O. Kuznetsov, T. P. Makhalova, Concept interestingness measures: a comparative study, in: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Concept Lattices and Their Applications, 2015, pp. 59–72.

[29] M. Klimushkin, S. Obiedkov, C. Roth, Approaches to the selection of relevant concepts in the case of noisy data, in: L. Kwuida, B. Sertkaya (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 5986 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 255–266.

[30] R. Emilion, Concepts of a discrete random variable, in: P. Brito, G. Cucumel, P. Bertrand, F. de Carvalho (Eds.), Selected Contributions in Data Analysis and Classification, Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 247–258.

[31] A. Torim, K. Lindroos, Sorting concepts by priority using the theory of monotone systems, in: Conceptual Structures: Knowledge Visualization and Reasoning, Springer, 2008, pp. 175–188.

[32] J. Cheng, Y. Ke, W. Ng, Delta-tolerance closed frequent itemsets, in: Data Mining, 2006. ICDM'06. Sixth International Conference on, IEEE, 2006, pp. 139–148.

[33] F. Moerchen, M. Thies, A. Ultsch, Efficient mining of all margin-closed itemsets with applications in temporal knowledge discovery and classification by compression, Knowledge and Information Systems 29 (1) (2011) 55–80.

[34] R. Belohlavek, M. Trnecka, Basic level of concepts in formal concept analysis, in: F. Domenach, D. Ignatov, J. Poelmans (Eds.), Formal Concept Analysis, Vol. 7278 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 28–44.

[35] R. Belohlavek, M. Trnecka, Basic level in formal concept analysis: Interesting concepts and psychological ramifications, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI '13, AAAI Press, 2013, pp. 1233–1239.

[36] G. L. Murphy, The big book of concepts, MIT press, 2002.

[37] E. Rosch, Principles of categorization, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978.

[38] E. P. Klement, R. Mesiar, E. Pap, Triangular norms, Springer Netherlands, 2000.

[39] M. D. Zeigenfuse, M. D. Lee, A comparison of three measures of the association between a feature and a concept, in: Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, 2011, pp. 243–248.

[40] R. Agrawal, R. Srikant, et al., Fast algorithms for mining association rules, in: Proc. 20th int. conf. very large data bases, VLDB, Vol. 1215, 1994, pp. 487–499.

[41] H. Mannila, H. Toivonen, A. I. Verkamo, Efficient algorithms for discovering association rules, in: KDD-94: AAAI workshop on Knowledge Discovery in Databases, 1994, pp. 181–192.

[42] M. G. Kendall, A new measure of rank correlation, Biometrika (1938) 81–93.

[43] L. Geng, H. J. Hamilton, Interestingness measures for data mining: A survey, ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR) 38 (3) (2006) 9.

[44] P. J. Azevedo, A. M. Jorge, Comparing rule measures for predictive association rules, in: Machine Learning: ECML 2007, Springer, 2007, pp. 510–517.

[45] M. Kirchgessner, V. Leroy, S. Amer-Yahia, S. Mishra, Testing interestingness measures in practice: A large-scale analysis of buying patterns, arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.04792.